



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 2022

by **O Marigold BSc DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/D/22/3297212

14 Ashley Street, St Werburghs, Bristol BS2 9RQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Duncan Au against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/06336/H, dated 24 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is a new mansard roof to replace the existing valley roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a proposed new mansard roof to replace the existing valley roof, at 14 Ashley Street, St Werburghs, Bristol BS2 9RQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/06336/H, dated 24 November 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 9733.01, 9733.02, 9733.03
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be those specified on the application form.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a mid-terrace, two storey dwelling. Ashley Street consists of rows of terraced dwellings. Each has a very similar, regular form, providing a strong character, including a butterfly roof, hidden from the front by a parapet. However, the curved shape and short length of the street, together with a slight stepping-up of building heights towards the end of the terrace, limit the degree and visibility of its uniformity. There is a diverse variety of dwellings nearby, including post-war housing and the former Brooks Dye Works, recently re-developed into large, modern brick dwellings.
4. The proposal would result in a taller ridge height than its immediate neighbours and would not be set back from the front of the building. However, its increase in height would be small relative to the overall proportions of the house.

Furthermore, little of the proposal would be visible from Ashley Street itself, because of the narrow width of the street and the screening effect provided by the parapet.

5. Whilst a greater extent of the proposal would be seen from Ashley Street Park opposite, trees within the park would heavily filter public views of it. The proposal would also be visible from Morley Street but would be seen in the context of the much taller development at the Brooks Dye Works such that it would not appear unduly out of place. The tapered form of the proposal means it would appear subservient to its host and would be clearly read as an addition to it. Given its proportions and its limited visibility, the proposal would not appear incongruous or dominant to the house, terrace or street. It would not therefore set an undesirable precedent.
6. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore comply with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Core Strategy (adopted June 2011), and policies DM26 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (adopted July 2014). These require that development reinforces local distinctiveness and respects the form of the original building and the broader street scene. The proposal would also comply with the guidance in Supplementary Planning Document 2 'A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions' (October 2005), which makes similar requirements.

Conditions

7. The Council has provided a list of conditions, which I have assessed, having regard to the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. As well as the standard time limit for commencement, a condition requiring adherence to the approved plans is necessary for certainty.
8. Although the Council has suggested that the external materials should match those used on the existing building, the proposal is for a slate roof, rather than the existing tiles. Slate would help to differentiate the proposal from the original dwelling. I shall therefore require that the external materials used are as stated in the application form, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

O Marigold

INSPECTOR